

**Indiana Professional Standards Board
External Committee for School Leaders**

Selections
February 13, 2004

Members Present: John Hill (chairperson), Mike Horvath, Earlene Holland, Dan Grayson, Peggy Hinckley, Ed Burkhalter, Nancy Carey, Don Criswell, Phyllis Amick, Cindy Ciriello, Pam Frampton, Gary Collings (recorder)

Members Absent: Steve Heck, Vince Barnes, Roger Thornton, Judy Garvey, Miriam Matthews, Earl Williams

Staff Present: Marie Theobald, Shawn Sriver, Kent Stoelting

University Consortium: Brad Balch (ISU), Larry Gambaiani (ISU), Deb Lecklider (Butler)

Guests Present: Mike Bonner (IWU), Kathy Sharp (IPS), Ed Wall (UI), Jane Boultinghouse (Bartholomew), Rosemary Rehak (Bartholomew)

The External Committee for School Leaders of the Indiana Professional Standards Board convened at 9:30 AM on February 13, 2004 at the MSD Washington Township Community and Education Center, Indianapolis.

I. Announcements - John Hill, chairperson, called the meeting to order and asked for introductions.

II. Approval - The selections of the November 14, 2003 meeting were approved after a motion by Pam Frampton with a second by Peggy Hinckley.

III. Update on Board Approval of Frameworks - Shawn Sriver reported that the IPSB approved all revisions of the frameworks including changes to the Director of Career and Technical Education, which will require re-promulgation of the appropriate sections of Rules 8 & 9 in the near future.

IV. Discussion of Short-term and Long-term Administration Assessment - Marie Theobald briefed the members on four issues:

(A.) The IPSB has now joined the Interstate Consortium on School Leadership (ICSL), which is different than the Interstate School Leaders Licensure Consortium (ISLCC) even though both are under the auspices of the Council of Chief State School Officers (CCSSO). In March 2003, all states were invited by the CCSSO to join the ICSL in support of interstate collaboration to improve leadership. In an upcoming meeting, the ICSL will begin its review of ISLCC standards, which need more measurability and research-based elements. Pam Frampton will be the IPSB representative to the future ICSL 2003 meetings (March, June, October).

(B.) Marie Theobald recently spoke with the ICSL director, Nancy Sanders, who confirmed that the Educational Testing Service (ETS) is not going to support the portfolio in the future. Shawn Sriver reminded members that we voted at our last meeting to postpone the portfolio but to maintain some type of assessment. The question remains as to what candidates will be told next year about assessments?

Pam Frampton recommended that we continue to develop a quality mentorship and put the portfolio development on hold for the first two years of administrators' careers. Phyllis Amick suggested that we consider waiving both the exam and portfolio and defer to licensure recommendations from the universities. Marie responded that a related problem is the language in Rules 2002, which, in part, provides that: (1) the initial license is based on university recommendations and the SLLA; and (2) the proficient license requires an assessment, which was originally to be the portfolio, to move from the initial license.

Pam Frampton remarked that all universities with leadership programs have some type of assessment sub-structure in place, which could be viewed as the assessment component for exit requirements. The two-year induction period could include evidence of standards-based professional growth with a mentor.

Marie Theobald commented that perhaps a professional growth plan (PGP) could culminate the two-year induction period and lead to the proficient license. John Hill asked if the university PGP could become a long-term plan? Brad Balch responded that this option was not in place now but was worthy of consideration. Shawn Sriver reminded members that at some point, the IPSB will need to know the end product. Shawn suggested that an IPSB staff member work with the University Consortium on ways to apply the PGP at the end of the induction period.

Marie Theobald distributed SB 268, which may further compound the dilemma. SB 268 was referred to the House Education Committee on February 12. It would require that the IPSB and DOE review the licensing requirements for school administrators, including whether it is necessary for an individual to be licensed as a teacher before acquiring a school administrator license.

(C.) In her conversation with Nancy Sanders, Marie was also informed that ETS is expected to terminate its offering of the School Leaders Licensure Assessment (SLLA) after the Fall 2004 administration (January and June test dates). The CCSSO is negotiating with ETS to extend the SLLA period through the Fall 2005 administration.

CCSSO and the ETS are attempting to settle the terms of the contract and determine which association owns the ISLLC *Standards for School Leaders*. ETS has reportedly not produced some of the "deliverables", which had apparently gone unnoticed due to management changes at the CCSSO. Revenue share for participating states, ownership status, etc. are among the multiple issues to be resolved.

Phyllis Amick inquired if the IPSB could suspend the Indiana Administrative Code rules? Marie responded that the administrative rules only address assessment and do not name the SLLA. There is, however, a cut-off score in the language. Marie thought we could re-direct the concept of assessment.

(D.) CCSSO is currently working with National Evaluation Systems (NES) as a new vendor to re-invent the SLLA and its future text administration. If ISLLC standards are to be refined without major revisions, the NES would develop and re-norm a national exam based on the revised standards. The needed additional time for this process is why the CCSSO is negotiating with the ETS to extend the SLLA testing commitment through Fall 2005. The weak areas of the SLLA are in diversity and technology.

Marie will call Doug Bohrer (ETS) for more information regarding the stopping date for the SLLA. She requested no action of committee members today until she has an opportunity to collect additional information. Members agreed that Marie and staff can report the additional information at the next meeting while the University Consortium considers alternatives to the portfolio.

V. March Mentor Training for 2003-04 School Year (Short-term Solution) - Brad Balch reported that a beginning administrator with a two-year Rules 2002 initial practitioner license person should be enrolled in the two-year mentoring and assessment program. The mentor for that beginning administrator should attend one of two training sessions scheduled for March 3 and 4, 2004. The next session will be May 20, 2004.

For information on those training sessions, contact Kent Stoelting <kstoelting@psb.state.in.us>. The session are four hours and focus on the Individualized Development Plan with needs assessment, which is developed by the protégé with his/her mentor. Other aspects of the training include an overview of the required documents, coaching, five-year renewal, and the professional growth plan. A detailed manual developed by the IPSB staff is provided.

Shawn Sriver commented that the IPSB is developing a list of trained mentors to be provided to school districts. Shawn noted that this committee will need to decide if this model is to continue. He asked if there would be any merit in inviting candidates from “other positions” besides principals, who are mentoring beginning administrators under Rules 2002? Shawn offered to e-mail the current list of 20+ mentors and the list of Rules 2002 administrators by position, who will require mentoring.

VI. Mentor Training Beyond 2003-04 School Year - John Hill asked members what alternatives we might see for the long-term? Pam Frampton replied that the University Consortium can only commit to two years for pilot training. The consortium does not have the infrastructure to maintain long-term training by the current members. Marie Theobald responded that during this two-year period the consortium will have developed a good model from which the IPSB can work with other providers to provide on-going training. Pam Frampton confirmed that the protégé assignment for each mentor is completed at the end of the two-year induction period for each candidate.

John Hill noted that the teacher mentor program has quality in the design consistent with the standards but quality implementation seems lacking. Cindy Ciriello remarked from her experience in teacher mentoring that the expectation of participants is another key component. Marie Theobald noted that there are currently 35 IPSB approved mentor training programs preparing mentors for the two-year Indiana Mentoring and Assessment Program. By July 1,

2006, all mentors for beginning teachers must have completed an approved mentor training program <<http://www.in.gov/psb/beginningteachers/mentorapproved.html>> .

Peggy Hinckley observed that the consistency of materials, content, process is an important consideration as an end result of the two-year pilot. She asked that the consortium consider a turn-key to a trainer-of-trainer model. Marie Theobald said her office does not currently have the funds for the IPSB to do such training; she is seeking alternatives to implement tracking and program evaluations to document what elements are making a difference. Larry Gambaiani offered the consideration of personnel from the nine regional service centers as a vehicle for on-going training. Gary Collings asked if service providers for the training could be identified in the second year of the pilot so that they might be involved in the final stages of implementing the training system? Phyllis Amick emphasized that the committee needs to identify criteria to guide its selection of service providers

Marie Theobald reported that stipends for mentors are in the biennial budget with a line item that allows \$600 per mentor (not for each protégé). This provision will present a problem in using retirees for multiple candidates. Shawn Sriver replied to a question that a mentor can be retired up to four years. Marie acknowledged that the two year pilot to be conducted by the consortium has a fiscal impact; she is committed to covering these immediate training costs even though funds for future training are yet to be determined.

Brad Balch asked when a candidate completes principal mentor training, can the person also mentor in a teaching subject area such as mathematics? It was the consensus of the members that mentorships should be discrete to either teachers or administrators and not overlap.

VII. Future Criteria for Mentors - John Hill reminded members that we now have a self-selecting process for mentors who complete an application. Do we want to continue this process? Although the superintendent is to sign-off as a recommendation, the nomination process may be inconsistent. John asked if there was a way to develop criteria to assist in the nomination process? Kathy Sharp replied that in the meantime we should continue to recruit those for whom we have confidence as potential mentors. Nancy Carey observed that contacting already busy people as desirable mentors often encourages them to get involved. Pam Frampton responded that criteria can be included in the consortium end product. Shawn Sriver reviewed that currently the school district assigns the mentors but names will eventually be required to come from a master list of qualified mentors to be maintained by the IPSB.

VIII. Planning Meeting for Next Meeting - May 14, 2004

IX. Other Business